DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 346 UD 012 161

TITLE [Issues in Desegregation.]
INSTITUTION California Univ., Riverside. Western Regional School Desegregation Projects.
PUB DATE [71]
NOTE 30p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Achievement Gains; Changing Attitudes; Court Litigation; *Educational Opportunities; Educational Quality; Equal Education; *Integration Effects; Integration Litigation; *Integration Methods; Longitudinal Studies; *School Integration; Self Esteem; *Urban Schools
IDENTIFIERS California; New York

ABSTRACT

Contents of this series of reports include: (1) "Issues in Desegregation," emphasizing that equality of educational opportunity is a basic legal and societal requirement to which other concerns, such as neighborhood schools, achievement levels, or busing are extraneous; (2) "The impact of recent Supreme Court decisions on achieving equal educational opportunity"; (3) "What specifically can integration give the minority child that he cannot get in a segregated school?" documents the achievement gains and positive attitude change that can occur in minority group students following school integration, using the case of Sacramento, California; (4) "What can integration offer the minority child," emphasizes that equal educational opportunities cannot be realized in segregated school systems; (5) "White Plains public schools report," reports the nation's first six-year longitudinal study of elementary grade pupils' achievement and progress in reading and arithmetic before and after school integration; (6) a review of the evidence that integration does not adversely affect the achievement of white majority students; (7) "How can children retain a sense of ethnic identity and individual self-worth in an integrated classroom?"; and, (8) "White children in the desegregation process." (JM)

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED 061 346

ISSUES IN DESEGREGATION

OPPORTUNITY

It is the desire of most educators to offer all children an opportunity to receive an education suitable to their needs and adequate to permit them to move within the society in whatever direction and to whatever level of achievement their talents and interests may lead them. Parents accept this as appropriate for their children. We are today, however, faced with a most critical social dilemma inhibiting movement toward this goal of educational fulfilment. In simplest terms it must be stated that some parents insist on a high quality of education for their children but will neither provide nor permit the same for other children.

REQUIREMENT

If equality of educational opportunity is the right and the responsibility of all children, then anyone interfering with its delivery is interfering with the fundamental rights of individual members of our society. This is not acceptable. The issue has been legally decided. To ignore this decision or to restrict its implementation, is illegal. Concerns such as neighborhood schools, achievement levels, or bussing, are relevant and extremely important education and community problems that should be dealt with and, hopefully, resolved. They are, however, extraneous to the basic legal and societal requirement of equality of educational opportunity.

AMERICAN CHILDREN

The separation of rich children from poor children, white children from black children, "American" children from Indian American, Mexican American, or Oriental American children in our educational institutions must cease. It has been found to be a disaster.

CHANGE

If these statements are true, and they are, how do we change what needs to be changed? Like it or not, our children must carry the burden of this change. The question that parents need to answer is whether they are willing to help?

UD012161

RESPONSIBILITY

What really happens when school districts desegregate? Some very good things. Some very bad things. Indications are that the results depend on the people involved: the educators, the parents, the children, and the community at large.

Kathleen Siggers, Ed.D
Information Dissemination, WRSDP

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

THE IMPACT OF RECENT SUPRIME COURT DECISIONS ON ACHIEVING EQUAL EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

Some legal concepts are important to those who have a role in designing and implementing plans to achieve racial and ethnic balance. These plans themselves should be legally as well as educationally sound in order to merit broad community support and to withstand court challenges.

No set of abstract principles can provide clear, reliable answers to the specific questions that arise in various fact settings. If this outline assists you in discerning which problems may have legal aspect that ought to be considered further, it will have served its purpose completely.

Any information or notions that you may have about the differences between de jure and de facto segregation should be put aside; they are lawyers' labels, not tools of analysis. This summary deals with that pupil separation on the basis of race that is illegal wherever it occurs.

A. Indicia of Illegal Segregation

1. Faculty and Staff - assignment of faculty and staff to schools on the basis of their race, i.e., with the result that the race of the faculty mirrors the race of the student body, is illegal. The statistical probabilities are that if minority staff members were assigned to schools on a nondiscriminatory basis, they would be scattered randemly throughout the system. Therefore, a pattern whereby the faculties of some schools are disproportionately of one race creates a presumption of illegal assignments and requires the school authorities to dispel the inference of illegal assignments. Moreover, since faculty and staff assignments are so clearly the responsibility of school authorities, an illegal pattern in that regard may raise certain presumptions about purportedly innocent (i.e., racially neutral) pupil assignments that have resulted in schools whose student bodies are disproportionately white or black (or brown).

The remedy for discriminatory faculty assignments is a proportional reallocation of faculty and staff, so that in a 70/30 (white/black) system each school's faculty would be approximately 70/30.

2. Pupils

(a) Attendance Zone Lines - many systems use zone lines that follow local topography and assign pupils to schools - up to their capacities - on basis of proximity of their residence. School segregation may result because of residential segregation, but such segregation has traditionally been regarded as innocent or fortuitous rather than illegal. However, segregation that results from gerrymandered zone lines that are contrived or artificial is illegal. A frequent clue to illegal zoning is the operation of an underutilized white school in a zone next to an overcrowded minority school. School authorities must then explain why they have not moved the zone line to adjust school capacities to pupil loads. If they have retained the zone line (or added portables at the overcrowded school) in order to avoid desegregation, that is

illegal.

(b) Parent-pupil Choices - school selection arrangements that result in pupil racial separation are illegal. Such arrangements take several forms: freedom of choice, free transfers, open enrollment, and optional schools within zones are the most common.

(c) Pupil Transportation - Northern systems do not have the dual overlapping bus routes that were characteristic of the South, but some systems have used practices resulting in illegal pupil separation. Pupils transported to relieve overcrowding or for safety reasons should be transported to the nearest school (serving their grades) with available space; transportation of black children past underutilized white school to other black schools, and vice-versa, is illegal.

(d) Site Selection, Construction and Expansion - school systems may not select sites for new schools, or expand existing ones, for the purpose of maintaining segregation; nor may they do so with that effect if they have other, less separatist alternatives. The courts have halted proposed construction, and required desegregation after new construction, where they have found that the site was selected in order to incorporate in the school system existing residential segregation.

(e) School Organization - school districts may structure their grades in various ways, but not for the purpose of creating or maintaining pupil segregation. For example, a district was held to have violated the law when its board rejected the superintendent's educationally sound middle-school (6-8) proposal in order to retain a number of segregated k-8 schools. Similarly, systems that depart from their regular grade structure in order to preserve segregation are in violation of the law. For instance, some 6-3-3 systems add grade 7 to this elementary school or grade 9 to that high school because the nearest junior high with space is attended predominantly by children of the opposite race; that is illegal.

(f) Residential Racial Segregation - although the Supreme Court has specifically avoided the question, some lower federal courts have held that, in districts which are residentially segregated as the result of public or private racial discrimination in housing, school systems must have an affirmatively integrationist pupil assignment policy, i.e., it is not enough to be racially "neutral" in assigning pupils to schools.

(g) Pupil Performance - although the Supreme Court has not addressed itself to the question, certain lower federal courts have held that racial separation of pupils, whatever the cause of it may be, is illegal where it results in a denial of equal educational opportunity, measured by achievement test scores or other neutral "output" criteria, to minority students. And in one important case the court ordered desegregation after receiving evidence that compensatory programs were less effective.

(h) Intra-School Segregation - it is just as illegal to assign pupils to separate classes or sections on the basis of race as it is to assign them to separate schools. Moreover, the courts have said that school systems have a heavy burden of justifying ostensibly neutral, objective pupil tracking arrangements that result in racially separate classes. The law in this area is still evolving, but it is at least clear from a number of Southern cases that the courts will not permit tracking to be used as a guise for what is actually intra-school separation.

B. Remedies

What must a school system do after a finding of illegal segregation has been made? In two recent cases the Supreme Court has unanimously endorsed the principle of achieving "the greatest possible degree of actual desegregation." The Court was careful to say that it was not requiring racial balancing, but the standard of maximum actual desegregation, limited only by administrative and economic feasibility, seems to amount to the same thing. Those were Southern cases, however, in which the Court noted that it was dealing with state imposed segregation laws mandating racially dual school systems. It can not yet be said with certainty that the same remedial criteria will be applied to systems where discrimination has produced illegal segregation short of absolute racial dualism. President Nixon has urged, for example (in March of 1970), that illegal segregation must be remedied but that school systems should be left free to deal with fortuitous separation as they see fit.

Some Northern courts have required racial balancing, but others have stopped short of that and merely prohibited the conduct found to be illegal. Therefore, until the Supreme Court decides a pertinent case, it is not certain that balancing is the uniform remedy for all violations.

On the other hand, a number of commentators have advanced persuasive arguments in support of maximum desegregation, and that is the approach of the pending federal legislation (s. 1557, 92nd Congress, 1st Session). First, if all the schools in a district are ethnically and-socio-economically alike, intra-district stability will be further because parents will no longer have an incentive to "flee" from school to school in search of an ethnic composition which they prefer. Second, whatever the legal requirements may be, if desegregation is educationally advantageous, it would seem prudent to maximize it. Third, balancing may help to ensure an equitable distribution of resources because all schools will be representative of the entire district, rather than as now in some districts which have some schools attended by the politically powerful and others by the less influential. Fourth, while doing the minimum will tend to invite continued litigation, balancing will tend to end it. Lastly, and perhaps most important from a legal standpoint, it is very difficult to quantify the effects of illegal policies. The amount of segregation produced by an illegal policy, as distinguished from that which is fortuitous, cannot be reliably measured. Therefore, unless a school district can clearly show otherwise, it would seem sensible to treat illegal policies as having pervasive effects and requiring comprehensive remedies.

Incidentally, there is no doubt that voluntary racial balance plans are entirely legal. In the recent words of the Supreme Court the Charlotte, North Carolina, case:

> School authorities . . . might well conclude, for example, that in order to prepare students to live in a pluralistic society each school should have a prescribed ratio of Negro to white students reflecting the proportion for the district as a whole. To do this as an educational policy is within the broad discretionary powers of school authorities....

C. Desegregation Plans

The courts have approved a wide variety of pupil assignment techniques to over-

come illegal segregation: rezoning, pairing, grouping, grade reorganization, transportation, majority to minority transfers, and educational parks are some of them. The point to be stressed here is that desegregation plans may not be themselves discriminatory. That is, plans that accomplish desegregation but in a way that disproportionately burdens or inconveniences minority families may be illegal. For example, school facilities must be abandoned from time to time for educational reasons, and such closings may unfortunately but necessarily inconvenience families who live nearby. However, it would be neither fair nor legal to abandon an educationally sound structure and transport the pupils elsewhere merely because it is a black school which some may think, white families would prefer not to attend.

The notion that desegregation is a one-way process whereby minority children are assigned to white schools is no less an illegal, racial insult than the aparthied condemned in Brown v. Board of Education. And it should be noted that the courts have forbidden plans that disproportionately inconvenience minority families where there are other equally effective, fairer alternatives.

In conclusion, as I noted in the beginning, these are general principles that require careful application to particular facts - and not always with the same results. Therefore, if you think that one of these questions has arisen in your district, I urge that you not try to solve it unaided, but instead seek the assistance that is available to you from your regional office or from Washington.

This summary of legal do's and don't's was contributed by the Division of Equal Educational Opportunities, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Washington, D.C. It offers information concerning legal attitudes toward the various aspects of school desegregation as these have been established by recent court decisions.

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

WHAT SPECIFICALLY CAN INTEGRATION GIVE THE MINORITY CHILD THAT HE CANNOT GET IN A SEGREGATED SCHOOL?

What has resulted from racial isolation?

When children are separated because of ethnic differences they have almost no opportunity to understand or properly evaluate each other. When discrimination is added to separation, differences between groups become exaggerated. The children sometimes have a hard time learning to work together and get along together. It has become the special task of educators to provide the kind of educational opportunities that will help all children to learn in school, not only about subject matter, but also about people.

Minority children in segregated schools have been observed in all sections of the United States to determine whether being segregated has truly influenced them. Over the years and as late as 1971 the story has been the same. The discriminated against minorities have averaged from two to four years behind the white population in academic achievement. Children start out as near equals in first grade, but the minority child falls further behind each year after that. Eliminating racial isolation has been shown to have no detrimental effect on majority children. It has been proven to benefit minority children by increasing their achievement levels and IQ scores. These gains, however, occur only some of the time and only under favorable circumstances. They depend on how the problems of integration are handled by the school district. The important fact is that improvement can happen and often does. A recent report from Sacramento, California, tells a story of success.

THE SACRAMENTO STORY

WHY DESEGREGATE?

In 1964 Sacramento was ordered by court injunction not to build its new junior high school on the site of the one that had been recently burned. The court further ordered that a plan to end racial imbalance at the school be in effect by September of 1964. The School District responded by reassigning all the children from the burned out school to other schools with low minority enrollment. Two years later a plan to eliminate segregation of elementary students was adopted.

Questions asked at that time were the same ones asked in nearly every other community that has faced desegregation: would this really help the minority child? Would it hurt the achieving, well adjusted majority child? What could the segregated child gain in an integrated classroom that he could not in an improved segregated one? Now, seven years later, the Sacramento City Unified School District can answer the questions. In a summary statement published in September of 1971 the Research and Development Services made these assertions.

1. Both parents and school staff members stated that there were numerous "positive effects resulting from the reassignment of minority pupils."

2. Discipline problems, which had never been listed as a major problem by most school personnel, became less with each year of integration.

3. Minority pupils reassigned to integrated schools tended "to perform better academically than do peers in ... segregated schools."

4. Majority pupils in schools receiving the reassigned pupils did not experience any adverse effects in their academic accomplishments.

What happened when Sacramento integrated?

One year after the school burning the minority group students who were reassigned to achieve racial balance showed the same gains in ability and mathematics as those in the receiving school. They did not gain as much in reading and writing achievement. Two years after the junior high school was destroyed the integrated minority students equaled the gains of the majority in ability, writing and mathematics. They significantly outgained them in reading achievement.

The elementary children had similar experiences. "Project Aspiration" was planned to eliminate "the adverse effects ... desegregation" in 1966 and was evaluated every year after. Each year the results were better. By 1971 Sacramento was able to report the following outcome:

1. Improved pupil performance in reading achievement, grades 1-6 and in arithmetic achievement, grades 2-6.

2. Pupil performance exceeded the performance anticipated in the objectives of the program.

3. "The resource teacher program and the English as a second language program appeared to be effective for those pupils served."

4. "The concentration of compensatory programs had a positive impact on pupils interest, attitudes, and attendance."

5. Changes measured by classroom teachers showed improvement in " "respect for authority," participation in activities, 'and interaction with other pupils' for integrated project pupils."

6. "Black integrated pupils achieved significantly higher gains . . . in reading and in arithmetic . . . than did non-integrated black pupils" who were given compensatory educational programs. Non-integrated black children without compensatory programs showed the least gain.

7. "Integrated pupils of Spanish Surname . . . exceeded the performance objectives set for mathematics in grades 2-5.

Why were the Sacramento schools able to accomplish their goals?

First, they made a commitment. Second, they had a plan. Third, they evaluated what was actually occuring every year, and they revised and improved their plan as they went along. They called upon and received community support. They provided bussing and free lunches to children who needed these. They provided training programs for teachers. They hired and trained teacher aides, community aides, special resource people, parents, and auxilary support staff. They worked hard to make their program work.

Sacramento is not unique in its efforts to solve integration problems and offer better educational opportunities to all its children. It has been more successful than some. Success, however, seems to be a result of the determination of a school community to reach new heights in serving the needs of its people.

RESOURCE INFORMATION: "A Summary of the Assessments of the District's Integration Programs, 1964 - 1971, and "An Evaluation Report on a Program of Compensatory Education, ESEA, Title I, Focus on Reading and Mathmatics, 1970 - '71." Sacramento City Unified School District, Sacramento, California.

Kathleen Siggers, Ed. D.
Associate Director
Information Dissemination, WRSDP

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

What Can Integration Offer The Minority Child

The notion has persisted since the early development of this country that the most law abiding, trustworthy, and moral people, certainly the best workers, are white. This myth has been reinforced by imposed segregation in the educational system which deliberately separates the powerful from the powerless. It does not seem likely that these ingrained ideas will be eliminated until societal integration occurs and all groups get to know and understand and appreciate one another as people.

What Difference Does It Make?

It was found in a study conducted by the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago that of 1700 Negroes, ages 21 to 45, those who had attended integrated schools averaged $300 a year higher in income than those from segregated schools. More were employed, more men worked in professional or white collar jobs, more had gone to college and fewer had dropped out of school (one third for men and one fifth for women). The integrated scored higher on achievement tests and were more likely to be living in integrated areas. All these could have been called socio-economic factors by assuming that the Negroes in integrated schools were more likely to be living in a higher income area. The fact is that "the kids who went to integrated and segregated schools [were] about the same in parent education, parents' occupation and family stability."[1]

Recent government figures show the unemployment rate among Mexican Americans to be twice that of Anglos with 79% of those employed holding unskilled or semi-skilled jobs. If these figures included farm workers they would be even more biased against the Mexican American. Anglos, on the average, have 30% higher incomes for the same number of years in school than Mexican Americans.[2] The reason given for this difference in employment status is lack of educational and technical skills. There is no disputing that in general the Mexican American receives less education than the Anglo.

By Court action in Texas in 1970 Mexican Americans were legally labeled "an identifiable ethnic minority group" on the basis of discrimination and segregation in schools, "a discrimination facilitated by the group's economical and political impotence."[3] Even those Mexican Americans who have educational competence, who have passed employment tests and met all skill requirements are often passed over because they are believed by the Anglo employers to be less capable. This treatment has been tested in several recent civil action cases in whith the individual Mexican American has benefited. The system that segregated the majority from the minorities, however, continues to breed these inequities. As long as education is basic to the system, it is here that segregation must be eliminated.

What Can Integration Offer My Child?

The question, "what can integration offer the minority child?" seems to imply not so much what can minority children gain, but what is ahead for my child? Does equal, quality education have to include moving him away from his neighborhood school at an early age?

The experiences of school districts that have achieved district wide racial balance show that the first step toward equal educational opportunity is total desegregation, not only racial and ethnic but also socio-economic. Minority children must be taught the basic skills needed to become educated: reading, arithmetic, language and communication. Integration must begin at the beginning.

What Are The Facts?

It was found in Hartford, Connecticut that inner city minority children who have not experienced the isolated education of the inner city schools in the early grades were reading at grade level or above.[4] Test scores reported for all grade levels in desegregated Berkeley in 1970 show minority group children improving in academic achievement. The greatest improvement was in the earliest grades when children were just beginning their educational experiences.[5]

In Connecticut children from schools that were 85% or greater Negro and Spanish speaking were reassigned to vacant seats in 34 different schools in five suburban communities. The results after testing, interviewing, and reviewing teacher reports showed that reassignment, if done by the third grade, has positive results. Improvement was reported in ability to understand and meet the educational demands of the school, in test taking skills, and in self-determination[6]

Four years after integration at Riverside minority children in the first three grades were comparable in trend to those of the majority children.[7] Average scores for all children in the first three grades had increased.

When Negroes, Puerto Ricans, Chinese and Jews were compared in New York City it was found that ethnically balanced schools were getting better performance from their pupils than ethnically imbalanced ones. Achievement scores of all ethnic groups were more similar in the balanced schools.[8]

In the city of Nashville fourth, fifth, and sixth grade Negro children in five desegregated schools were compared with the same number of students in three all Negro schools. All children lived in the same neighborhood. The children who had been in the desegregated schools since early in their schooling scored higher in achievement than either the segregated pupils or the recently desegregated children.[9]

A 1970-71 study reported by the Sacramento Board of Education compared children in integrated schools with children in segreated schools who were given compensatory education, and children in segregated schools with no special educational program offered. Five hundred twenty-eight children were included in the investigation. It was found that the minority children *in integrated classrooms tested an average 10% higher in all grades* (two to sixth) than those in segregated schools who were given special compensatory programs to improve their educational skills. Those children who were segregated and did not receive compensatory education scored the lowest of all. All children involved were from the same neighborhood and all were of similar socio-economic backgrounds.[10]

When Does Desegregation Work?

There is no question that minority children have benefited when racial isolation was eliminated. This has occurred only some of the time, however, and only under favorable circumstances. There have been occasions when children have not shown gain under desegregation. The important fact is that improvement can take place. The concern is how to make it occur.

Stanley Matzen tested eleven hundred fifth and seventh grade children in the San Francisco Bay area. He found that Negroes had higher achievement scores in classrooms that had a relatively lower per cent Negroes. He also found that classroom grouping has much to do with the achievement of the Negroes. When the high achieving whites were separated out into one classroom and the low achieving blacks into another, no gains were made. Other factors such as instruction, attitudes, and expectations were found to influence achievement levels even more than the racial mix. He concluded, that racially mixed classrooms, properly integrated, were highly important to the social and emotional development of all the children present.[11]

Why Integration?

To ignore the results of the "separate but equal" experience of the past one hundred years is folly. Compensatory education has not been able to close the achievement gap between the majority and the minority child. If the best of educational opportunities were made available in minority schools, gains undoubtedly would be made. But how realistic is it to expect this to happen? How long would it take? How great would the improvement be? Would parity of educational opportunity occur?

Separation because of ethnic difference sustains and supports prejudice. It appears that until all children of all ethnic groups have an opportunity to interact the educational opportunities of some will be restricted.

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

1. _____, "Approaches to Desegregation: The Superintendent's Perspective; A Dialogue on April 27-29, 1969," as reported by Robert L. Crain, The John Hopkins University. (Riverside, California, University of California Extension, Riverside, n.d.) p. 23-34.

2. Rowan, H. The Mexican American (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1968) in Guadalupe Salinas, "Mexican Americans and the Desegregation of Schools in the Southwest" Houston Law Review, Volume 8, p. 929, (Houston, Texas: 1971).

3. Civil Action No. 68-C-95 (S.D. Texas, June 4, 1970) (noted, 49 Texas Law Review p. 337, 1971) in Guadalupe Salinas, "Mexican Americans and the Desegregation of Schools in the Southwest" Houston Law Review, Volume 8, p. 929, (Houston, Texas: 1971).

4. Mahan, Aline M., and Mahan, Thomas W., "Changes in Cognitive Style: An Analysis of the Impact of White Suburban Schools on Inner City Children". Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association (77th, Washington, D.C., September 1969).

5. _____, "Hearing before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the United States Senate, Ninety-second Congress." Equal Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971) p. 4552.

6. Crane, Thomas, "A Three Year Summary of Hartford Project Concern (a Program of Urban-Suburban Corporation)." (Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Education, Bureau of Compensatory and Community Educational Services).

7. Purl, Mabel C., Dawson, Judith, "A Report on the Achievement of Elementary Pupils in Integrated Schools," Riverside Unified School District, Department of Research and Evaluation (Sacramento: California State Department of Education, Office of Compensatory Education, May, 1970).

8. Lesser, Gerald S., Rosenthal, Kristine M., Polkoff, Sally E., and Pfankuch, Marjorie B., "Some Effects of Segregation and Desegregation in the Schools," Integrated Education (June-July, 1964).

9. Anderson, Louis V., "The Effects of Desegregation on the Achievement and Personality Patterns of Negro Children" (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1966) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-11, 237). In Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal, 2nd Edition (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, May, 1970).

10. _____, "A Summary of the Assessments of the District's Integration Programs, 1964-1971" (Sacramento, California: Sacramento City Unified School District, 1971).

11. Matzen, Stanley P., "The Relationship Between Racial Composition and Scholastic Achievement in Elementary School Classrooms" (unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1965) (University Microfilms Order No. 66-2518). In Meyer Weinberg. Desegregation Research: An Appraisal, 2nd Edition (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, May, 1970).

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

W

WHITE PLAINS PUBLIC SCHOOLS' REPORT

(Reproduced by permission of the Superintendent)

White Plains, N.Y. -- Closing the Gap

Complete integration of the city schools in White Plains, New York, is helping Negro pupils close the traditional gap between their academic achievement and the academic achievement of middle class white pupils, a six-year study released here today indicates.

Progress in Reading and Arithmetic

The nation's first six-year longitudinal study of elementary grade pupils' achievement and progress in reading and arithmetic -- before and after school integration also demonstrates that:

Negro pupils who have attended integrated schools since first grade are making better grades than Negro pupils who were in third grade when the school system was integrated.

And both of these Negro groups are doing better than did Negro children who spent kindergarden through sixth grade in segregated schools before the 1964 citywide integration.

White youngsters are doing as well as, or better than, comparable groups of white children did in all-white neighborhood schools before the 1964 citywide integration.

There has been no flight from the public schools by middle class white families as a result of school integration.

De Facto Segregation Eliminated

White Plains (K-12 enrollment of 8,700) was the first city school system to abolish de-facto segregation by setting minimum and maximum Negro enrollment

quotas for every school building.

Under the Racial Balance Resolution unanimously adopted by the five-member Board of Education in April, 1964, no school building in the city is permitted to have less than approximately 10 per cent Negro enrollment nor more than approximately 30 per cent Negro enrollment.

To achieve citywide integration in September, 1964, Superintendent of Schools Carroll F. Johnson and the Board closed one predominantly Negro center city elementary school, changed attendance zones for the other 10 elementary schools and the three junior high schools, and instituted school bus service, transporting center city Negro pupils to previously all or mostly white elementary schools in outlying residential sections of the city. Attendance zones are revised annually to insure that the prescribed balance is maintained. The senior high, for grades 10-12, has been integrated all along, being the only senior high in the city.

(The city, county seat of Westchester County, has a population of 55,000 and a median family income of $8,200. Twenty-six per cent of White Plains households, however, have incomes below $5,000 and 14.5 per cent of the households have incomes below $3,000. Most of these families live in the center city and most are Negro. Of the 4,600 elementary pupils in the public schools, 18.6 per cent are Negro; 17.3 per cent of the 2,000 junior high pupils are Negro and 12.4 per cent of the 2,200 senior high pupils are Negro.)

Evaluation

To study the performance of children before and after integration, Study Director Marian F. Graves focused on the elementary schools, which bore the main impact of integration.

Results of Stanford Achievement tests in reading and arithmetic, given annually in the elementary grades, were examined to see how comparable groups of white children performed before and after integration, and to determine how comparable groups of Negro pupils performed before and after the 1964 integration.

The white and Negro pre-integration control groups were pupils who were in third grade in 1960. Their third and fifth grade reading and arithmetic percentile rankings were compared with the third and fifth grade reading and arithmetic percentile rankings of the post-integration group, the white and Negro children who were in third grade in 1964 when the schools were integrated.

White Children Show Gains

The results show that white children not only have not been harmed by integration, but are making better grades on most of the tests than did the 1960 white control group -- children who attended all-white schools from first through sixth grades:

The post-integration white group's median was significantly higher (five or more percentile points) on paragraph meaning and arithmetic computation tests in third and fifth grade than was the median of the pre-integration control group. The post-integration white group's median on arithmetic reasoning was the same in third grade and 10 percentile points higher in fifth grade than the arithmetic reasoning median for white children who had attended only all-white schools. On word meaning tests, the post-integration white group's median was at the 95th percentile nationally in third grade and at the 90th percentile nationally in fifth grade. The median for the pre-integration white children was at the 88th percentile nationally in the third grade and at the 90th percentile nationally in fifth grade.

Negro Children Show Gains

Negro children who have attended integrated schools since they were in first grade are doing significantly better than either the Negro children who were in third grade when integration started or the Negro children who were in a segregated school from first through sixth grades, the report released today by the Superintendent and the Board shows.

The always-integrated Negro group's median on paragraph meaning in third grade was at the national median -- 50 percentile -- whereas the median for Negro youngsters who were third graders the year integration started was only at the 35th percentile nationally.

On word meaning, the always-integrated Negro pupils had a median at the 55th percentile, five points above the national percentile and five points above the Negro children who were in third grade when integration started.

In arithmetic reasoning the always-integrated Negro pupils also had a five-point higher median than the Negro children who were in third grade when integration started. Medians for the two groups on arithmetic computation were the same, at the 35th percentile nationally.

Greatest Gains Where Integration Starts Early

But the Negro pupils who were in third grade when integration started are doing significantly better than Negro pupils who spent grades one through six in a segregated school: Between third and fifth grade 45 per cent of the group made at least two years' progress in one or more of the four test areas--word and paragraph meaning, arithmetic computation and reasoning. In contrast, only 25 per cent of the always-segregated Negro children made that much progress between third and fifth grades.

"Many Negro children seem to be keeping up now in one or more areas," says the report. "As they go on in school, the difference between their achievement and their placement may become narrower rather than greater, as was the pattern for most center city children in the past."

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

HOW CAN THE POOR LEARNING SKILLS AND ATTITUDES TOWARD SCHOOL OF CHILDREN FROM LOW ACHIEVING SCHOOLS BE KEPT FROM LOWERING THE STANDARDS OF CHILDREN IN HIGH ACADEMIC SCHOOLS?

What is the problem?

What is implied by this question is that low achievers will negatively influence the skills and attitudes of high achievers. Parents in communities where the "better" schools are located are well aware that their children are receiving educational opportunities superior to those offered children who go to schools in less privileged areas. The problem is how to structure a system of parity in educational opportunity without losing the gains that have already been made.

In Denver, Colorado, May, 1969, a pro-integration school board was defeated partially because of the fear expressed by many voters that bringing Negro children into Anglo schools would lower the academic achievement level of the children in the receiving schools. Two researchers, one of whom was a regular employee of the Denver Public Schools, studied what actually had happened to achievement scores in schools that had begun receiving Negro students. They compared scores for 1967-68 when no Negro children had attended, with scores in 1968-69 when the schools had become desegregated. It was found that in spite of the adverse publicity that had cost the election, "there was no evidence of any general effect of the presence of Negro students on the academic achievement of the non-Negro pupils."2 A further result showed that in six of thirteen subtests administered, children in integrated schools scored higher than children in non-integrated while in only one subtest did the non-integrated score higher.

What are the facts?

Many articles have been written concerning the realtionship between poor attitudes and low motivation of minority children, and learning ability. What has been found is that minority group children learn at the same rate as white children who are of the same socio-economic level. It has also been discovered that when children who are achieving at a low level in "poor" schools are placed in a classroom with children of a higher socio-economic status and achievement level, the low achievers adopt the achievement patterns and school attitudes of the higher achievers.

To quote directly from the Coleman report, "If a minority pupil from a home without much educational strength is put with students with strong educational backgrounds, his achievement is likely to increase."3 In answer to the segregationist's charge that "academic achievement of whites in desegregated schools falls", Meyer Weinberg writes, "This view is contradicted by virtually every piece of controlled research into the actual classroom."4

What has been the experience in schools where low achievers were placed with high achievers? In New York City and Baltimore, children in lower socio-economic schools were found to be more flexible and more able to adjust to new situations than the middle and upper class children studied. They were more able to respond to what was expected and required from them.[5]

What makes the difference?

In studying learning styles in four Job Corps Centers and in two vocational high schools in Baltimore it was found that learning achievement was directly related to the attitudes projected by the schools. Where "no real achievement was expected of students, ... none resulted."[6] However, in the predominently white schools in Baltimore, when minorities were treated as equals and were expected to perform at a high level of achievement, they measured up to expectations.

In the Equal Education Opportunities Hearings conducted by the Senate committee in San Francisco in 1971,[7] some interesting evidence was uncovered about learning. It was found that the home background of the pupils already in the classroom had a major influence on the achievement levels of all the pupils including those that had been reassigned. The achievement level of the integrating students was influenced more by the achievement and attitudes of the receiving student body than on any other factor including socio-economic level or ethnic background. In other words, when low achievers are moved into classrooms that are measureably higher in achievement, the low achievers will adapt to the learning attitudes and achievement patterns of the higher achievers. This evidence was verified by the USOE study on equality of education.[8]

What dangers exist?

It would appear that there is little real danger of falling achievement levels when the undereducated are integrated into the advantaged classroom. There are cautions that should be observed, however. In the examples cited, and in the experiences of school desegregation generally, achievement levels have remained the same or have improved when poor achievers were integrated into classrooms where educational goals were higher and the expectations of both students and teachers were toward academic advancement. The evidence is overwhelmingly clear that improvement in achievement under these circumstances is socio-economically rather than racially based. The improvement is caused by a combination of plus factors which include positive teacher and peer group attitudes, suitable curriculum, realistic teaching strategies, and expectations of success that are understood by all the children.

Kathleen Siggers, Ed.D.
Associate Director
Information Dissemination, WRSDP

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

1. Coleman, James S., et al, Equality of Educational Opportunity (National Center for Educational Statistics, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1966)

2. Pettigrew, Thomas F., A Profile of the Negro American (Princeton, New Jersey: D. Van Nostrand, 1964)

3. Coleman, loc. cit.

4. Weinberg, Meyer, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal, 2nd Edition (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1970); discussing Henry E. Garrett, "Desegregation: Fact and Hokum" (Richmond, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press, n.d.) and "children: Black and White" (Kilmarnock, Virginia: Patrick Henry Press, 1968)

5. Ibid Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research:

6. Coleman, loc. cit.

7. Hearings before the Select Committee on Equal Educational Opportunity of the U.S. Senate, ninety-second Congress, Equal Educational Opportunity (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971)

8. U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Racial Isolation in the Public Schools, II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967)

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

HOW CAN CHILDREN RETAIN A SENSE OF ETHNIC IDENTITY AND INDIVIDUAL SELF WORTH IN AN INTEGRATED CLASSROOM?

What do we mean by self worth?

Self worth is what a person thinks of himself and what he aspires to become. In a sense it is a judgment one makes about himself as he compares his capacities with other people's with whom he associates. If his appraisal is correct and his goals realistic he usually acquires a comfortable sense of self assurance and self acceptance.

It is generally thought that minority and low income children have feelings of worthlessness while children in the white, affluent social strata have high opinions of themselves. This is not necessarily true as people tend to judge themselves in relation to their immediate peers, and within the circumstances of their experience. The frustration of powerlessness and oppression that is observable in minority group children and the anger which this often provokes, is not necessarily a demonstration of low self evaluation.

Measurements of self worth show that children in segregated schools, both white and black, have unrealistically high aspirations. Mexican Americans measure lower than other major ethnic groups in feelings of self worth.

How does segregation affect children?

Integration between races in this country, except for very recent times, occurred primarily in low income areas. For whites, separation usually implies purposeful exclusiveness by those who can afford to live in the "better areas." Segregation for blacks and browns has been imposed, often by circumstances other than education such as housing, available employment, and other socio-economic factors.

There is evidence from social investigations that segregation produces feelings of "imposed inferiority" among minority group children. In Berkeley more Negroes planned to go to college in schools that were predominently black than in schools where Negroes were in the minority. This was explained as being due to peer support in segregated schools where leadership rolls and academic status were gained under limited competition. Negroes in the segregated black schools, however, were less prepared for college than those in the integrated schools.

How do children measure self worth?

Most evaluations of how children feel about themselves conclude that children from minority groups become more realistic in their goals and more positive about themselves in relation to white chidren after integration. The fact of imposed segregation is always devaluating to racial and ethnic minorities. Unrealistically high aspirations are often a false defense against the sickening feelings of low self worth.

Anglo children in segregated schools, on the other hand, develop an exaggerated sense of self worth in relation to minority children, assuming a superiority which is usually carefully supported by the school itself and is a major reason for the separation in the first place. Because people almost always judge themselves in relation to their peers both in the home and in the school, and because their schools are often highly competitive, Anglos frequently feel incompetent. This perhaps explains their tendency to offset this by over-evaluating their capabilities in relation to minorities. It may be why it is so difficult for the adults in our society to accept minorities on an equal basis.

Why do the segregated feel alienated?

Articles dealing with self identity can be interpretated in several ways. Both Negroes in ghettos and Mexican Americans in barrios have developed, in many cases, close family relationships based on the need for mutual assistance. The cultural concept of education is survival.[2] The Negro is much more dissatisfied with where he lives than are whites[3] but usually is unable to find any alternative.[4] The need to move out is often expressed in high educational goals. Hopelessness and social isolation are constant depressants to individual self esteem which inhibit any kind of upward movement. Often a ghetto dependency results which causes the individual to remain in the ghetto or barrio even after he is economically able to leave. This phenomenon is sometimes misread as an example of ethnic identity but is more likely to be centered in inadequacy and insecurity.

A study which compared Negroes who had moved into integrated areas in Baldwin Hills with those who had remained in the ghettos of West Los Angeles found that "feelings of alienation and powerlessness were significantly less" in the racially mixed areas. The single factor most related to increased self worth was the experience of attending integrated schools.[5]

Why is white desirable?

In almost all tests of race identification Negro children at all ages still tend to select white as more desirable than black although to a lessening degree since the active promotion of blackness by Negro leadership. The implication is that in the eyes of children, the advantages lie with the whites, and they are

desirous of sharing in these. Mexican Americans, on the other hand, have tended to divide themselves within their culture, those who could, assimilating with whites. This has to some extent, left the old, the poor, and the less economically secure behind in the barrios.

In Detroit and Ypsilanti, Michigan, self esteem of Negroes was found to be higher in desegregated schools than in segregated ones. Two reasons were believed to cause this. First, to be in a segregated school was in itself a symbol of inferiority and second, the perceptions the Negro children had of the capabilities of whites was highly exaggerated and confused with the obvious power centered in the white community. Desegregated Negroes had learned both to accept and understand whites, and were able to handle their own feeling of racial difference in a much more effective way.[6]

In comparing Negro students in an all-Negro college in Texas with Negroes in a white college which had recently desegregated, also in Texas, it was discovered that the Negroes in both colleges were high in their sense of self worth, but those in the desegregated college were higher.[7]

How should integration occur?

An interesting investigation into the Mexican American culture in Los Angeles found that Mexican American students born in Mexico received higher grades than those born in California. This was explained by the fact that the longer a family lived in Los Angeles the more segregated it became. A ghettoization took place that lowered the self esteem of the Mexican American which affected his achievement in school.[8]

Some other interesting points have been reported about Mexican American self esteem. In Los Angeles it was discovered that the Mexican youth who identified with Mexican culture experienced less conflict, was more education-minded, and had less out of school problems including arrests.[9] It can be concluded that Mexican Americans and perhaps all minorities need a sense of cultural belonging. This should be considered as school districts establish integrated classrooms.

How does integration fit into this picture?

If integration is seen as an opportunity to build a pluralistic society representative of all cultural groups that come together, there is no question that ethnic identity and self worth will be better served after desegregation occurs.

Ethnic identity, self esteem, positive feelings of success are all products of the individual as he is growing up. The child who feels isolated either in a segregated or an integrated classroom is going to suffer feelings of inadequacy and devaluation. There is a large amount of evidence that the minority child

has been considered inferior by teachers and school administrators. Expectations of low I.Q. and low achievement have become selffulfilling prophecies for the minorities.

"How can children retain a sense of ethnic identity and individual self worth in an integrated classroom?"

The question, translated into minority group concerns simply asks, "how can my child feel important and be proud of his ethnic heritage in a classroom in which most of his peers and his teachers regard him as inferior?" There is one simple answer to this question. He cannot. Those who are proposing an integrated society must be well aware of their responsibilities to every child to provide for him a learning environment in which he can come to appreciate himself as an individually worthwhile being.

Kathleen Siggers, Ed.D.
Associate Director
Information Dissemination, WRSDP

FOOTNOTE REFERENCES

1. Wilson, Alan B. "Residential Segregation of Social Classes and Aspirations of High School Boys," American Sociological Review, (December, 1959).

2. Moore, William, Jr., "A Portrait: The Culturally Disadvantaged Pre-school Child." (Doctoral dissertation, St. Louis University, 1964) in Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research: An Appraisal, 2nd Edition, (Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Zappa, 1970).

3. The Interuniversity Social Research Committee--Chicago Metropolitan Area, Militancy for and Against Civil Rights and Integration in Chicago: Summer, 1967 (Chicago: Community and Family Center, University of Chicago, August 1, 1967), in Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research, op cit.

4. Feagin, Joe R., "The Social Ties of Negroes in an Urban Environment: Structure and Variation" (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, March, 1966) in Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research, op cit.

5. Bullough, Bonnie Louise, "Alienation in the Ghetto," American Journal of Sociology, 72 (1966-67).

6. Haggstrom, Warren C., "Self-esteem and Other Characteristics of Residentially Desegregated Negroes" (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan, 1962) (University Microfilms Order No. 63-359).

7. Bartie, Geraldine McMurry, "The Perceptual Characteristics of Disadvantaged Negro and Caucasian College Students" (Doctoral dissertation, East Texas State University, 1967) (University Microfilms Order No. 68-1128).

8. Kimball, William L., "Parent and Family Influences on Academic Achievement Among Mexican-American Students" (Doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles, 1968) (University Microfilm Order No. 68-16, 550).

9. Derbyshire, Robert L., "Adolescent Identity Crisis in Urban Mexican Americans in East Los Angeles," in Eugene B. Brody (ed.), Minority Group Adolescents in the United States (Baltimore, Maryland: Williams and Wilkins, 1968) in Meyer Weinberg, Desegregation Research, op cit.

intergroup
University of California, Riverside 92502

WHITE CHILDREN IN THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS

by Meyer Weinberg

Segregated schools exact a high price from white children.

1. Under segregation minority and majority schools are shortchanged. Quality education is usually measured by academic achievement. High achievement means higher than average achievement, and average achievement must include the very low levels that are tallied in those segregated schools which can offer very limited educational opportunities. White parents have settled for much less than they realize by permitting educational deterioration at the low end of the scale. This produces a tendency for the entire school system to decline.

2. Under segregation, white children are usually subjected to an unrestrained racist education which breeds a false sense of superiority. Not only may they learn to think of minority children and people as less than human; it also becomes harder for them to learn their own potential and talent. Self-knowledge suffers.

3. Under segregation, white children are educated to live in a white world in which blacks, browns and other minorities are invisible. This fundamental distortion of reality ill-prepares children to understand the multi-racial character of American Society. It penalizes white children by omitting vast areas of knowledge from their study and personal acquaintance.

Thus, white children have a large stake in desegregation. How, in fact, have they fared under segregation?

Academic Achievement

In desegregated schools, white children continue to learn at their accustomed rate. This has proved repeatedly to be the case. Here are a few typical examples.

After three years (1968-1971), white children in Evanston, Illinois schools maintained their achievement.[1]

After two years (1967-1969), white children in Hartford, Connecticut, were

found to be achieving at their usual rate.[2]

After three years of desegregation, covering 1966-1969, Riverside, California school authorities found that white children's achievement did not sag.[3]

The exact technique of desegregation did not seem to affect learning. In Hartford, none of the white children was bussed; in Riverside, very few were; in Evanston a fairly large number were.

Did white children learn at the expense of the black children?

Not at all. In fact, in some instances black children's achievement rate rose so rapidly that it exceeded that of white children. This was the case in Jackson, Michigan, as reported in a study by Katzenmeyer.[4] Another example was Samuels' study of New Albany, Indiana.[5] In almost all other cases, the achievement rate of black children rose, even if it did not equal or exceed that of white children. These are excellent instances of productive equality, of achievement at no expense to anyone else.

White parents might well ponder one implication of these studies. Their children's earlier achievement was not the product of segregation. Indeed, segregation was not even an advantage for achievement. The separation of white from black or other minority children was thus not an educational necessity but an incursion of political power in the classroom.

Children were being "used" for political purposes!

Interracial Relations

A desegregated school is one of the few places in American society where persons of varying ethnic groups can cooperate as equals in a benevolent setting. Does it work out this way in practice?

Porter found that in desegregated pre-schools in Boston, five-year old children already had racial conceptions and expessed racially-tinged emotions. Yet, actual play between black and white children went on apace. White boys developed a more positive attitude toward black children than did white girls. "In a quality interracial setting," writes Porter, "white children have an opportunity to have their stereotypes corrected by actual association with blacks. . ."[6]

Dorothy Singer studied black and white fifth graders in New York state. White children who had frequent contact with black children were more willing to associate with them. On the other hand, white children who had infrequent contact with black

children "perceived the Negro in a distorted manner, giving him intellectual credit, but refusing to associate with him."[7] Kosler and associates found in a study of five schools that when classrooms reflected the racial composition of the schools as a whole that there were "positive relationships between school racial balance and the favorableness of interracial attitudes with any possible effects of socioeconomic status controlled."[8]

Marjorie McDonald, a psychoanalyst in a therapeutic nursery school and kindergarden in Cleveland, concluded after a searching study of the institution: "The racially integrated infant and pre-schooler gains a special advantage to his own identity formation. He gains a greater thoroughness of resolution of his ordinary developmental conflicts. He gains a greater ability to form and maintain object relationships, including those with members of other races."[9]

Two separate studies - one by Marascuilo and Levin, the other by Koslin and associates - found that children who entered into interracial friendships tended to regard their school in a more positive light.[10]

Quality of Interaction

There is no magic in desegregation itself. Simply having black and white children in the same school does not insure constructive cooperation between them. Porter emphasizes the need for "an active attempt to create an atmosphere of interracial tolerance, rather than simply desegregation or racial mixture alone."[11]

The penalty of schoolmen failing to create such an atmosphere can be very severe. Two separate studies, for example, have been made recently of disorders in urban high schools. Both studies agree that (1) the greatest disorders occurred at schools that recently became desegregated and (2) at nearly all these schools the authorities had not prepared staff, student body, and community for the impending changes.[12]

Intellectual Horizons

In a desegregated school, white children's intellectual horizons are widened. The openness of whites to such enlargement is usually underestimated.

Feagin analyzed responses of a national sample of whites during 1968. He found: ". . .A majority of white Americans, if a bare majority, see the contributions of Negroes to American history as important. . .Also unexpected is the substantial support of these whites for school subjects which might stimulate Negro pride."[13] Caselli evaluated the responses of white seniors in a Santa Rosa California, high school who had participated in a unit of black history study

lasting six weeks. He found a high level of enthusiasm among the students. "Many students," he reported, "expressed a kind of angry amazement to learn that the educational establishment had not made them aware of these contributions [by blacks] at any time during their prior eleven-plus years of school."[14]

Conclusion

Evidence is ample, from research and daily classroom experience, that desegregation can be extraorinarily helpful to children of all races. There is no ground for believing that desegregation is designed to benefit black and Chicano but not white children.

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

Meyer Weinberg is editor and contributing author of *Integrated Education: Race and Schools*, and author of *Desegregation Research: An Appraisal; Race and Place;* and *Man and Society*. He has recently published a comprehensive bibliography, *The Education of the Minority Child*.

This article is a republication of an editorial originally printed in "Intergroup Newsletter" (Riverside, California: Western Regional School Desegregation Projects, University of California, Riverside, November 1971)

REFERENCES

1. Jayjia Hsia, Integration in Evanston, 1967-71: A Longitudinal Evaluation (Evanston, Illinois: Midwestern Office, Educational Testing Service, August, 1971).

2. Aline M. and Thomsa W. Mahan, "Changes in Cognitive Style: An Analysis of the Impact of White Suburban Schools on Inner City Children," Integrated Education, 8 (1970).

3. Harry Singer, Effect of Integration on Achievement in Riverside: A Three-Year Trend, August 31, 1969, p. 10.

4. William G. Katzenmeyer, Social Interaction and Differences in Intelligence Test Performance of Negro and White Elementary School Pupils (Doctoral dissertation, Duke University, 1962), University Microfilms Order No. 63-2227.

5. Ivan G. Samuels, Desegregated Education and Differences in Academic Achievement (Doctoral dissertation, Indiana University, 1958), University Microfilms Order No. 58-2934.

6. Judith D.R. Porter, Black Child, White Child. The Development of Racial Attitudes (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1971), p. 215.

7. Dorothy G. Singer, Interracial Attitudes of Negro and White Fifth-Grade Children in Segregated and Unsegregated Schools (Doctoral dissertation, Columbia University, 1966), p. 114.

8. Sandra C. Koslin, Bertram L. Koslin, Richard Pargament, and Harvey Waxman, "Effects of School Balance on Racial Attitudes," no date, p. 4.

9. Marjorie McDonald, Not By the Color of Their Skin. The Impact of Racial Differences on the Child's Development (N.Y.: International Universities Press, 1970), p. 162.

10. Leonard A. Marascuilo and Joel R. Levin, "Inter- and Intraracial Group Differences in the Perception of a Social Situation," unpublished paper read at the February, 1966, annual meeting of the American Education Research Association; Sandra C. Koslin, Marianne Amarel, and Nancy Ames, "A Distance Measure of Racial Attitudes in Primary Grade Children: An Exploratory Study," Psychology in the Schools, October, 1969, p. 385.

11. Porter, p. 214.

12. Robert J. Havighurst, Frank L. Smith, and David E. Wilder, A Profile of the Large-City High School (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, November, 1970); Stephen K. Bailey, Disruption in Urban

Public Secondary Schools (Washington, D.C.: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1971).

13. Joe R. Feagin, "Black History and White Americans," Integrated Education, 8 (November-December, 1970), 22-27.

14. Ron Caselli, "White Student Reaction to Black Studies," Integrated Education, 8, (September-October, 1970), 31-35.